1	
2	
3	
4	
5	CLARK, LINCOLN, AND WHITE PINE counties
6	GROUNDWATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
7	DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
8	SCOPING MEETING
9	
10	
11	
12	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
13	
14	On Monday, August 15, 2011
15	At 4:00 p.m.
16	
17	At the Henderson Convention Center
18	200 S. Water Street
19	Henderson, Nevada
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Reported by: Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR

(Initial introductions by

(Initial introductions by

Facilitator John Godec.)

(Comments already in progress
by Dr. Michael Dwyer.)

2.2

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: We prepared this document in response to an application we received in 2004 from the Southern Nevada Water Authority to construct and operate a pipeline to transport groundwater from east central Nevada to Southern Nevada.

made by the Bureau of Land Management on this application yet. The National Environmental Policy Act requires that before we make that decision, we document and consider the impacts of that proposed action. This document is the vehicle for doing that, for documenting and for conveying those impacts to the person who will make that decision on the application, and that's why it's so important.

This hearing is your opportunity to help us make it as clear, as comprehensive and as accurate as it can be. Seven alternatives are analyzed in this document, six of them are action alternatives that involve various levels of production in different water basins where that production would occur. The

seventh alternative, the No Action alternative, describes the impacts if the BLM were to deny this permit and continue with current land uses.

2.2

Let me be clear what this hearing is not.

First it's not about the allocation of water rights.

That's not a decision the Bureau of Land Management can make, that's a decision that is in the hands of the State of Nevada, and more specifically the state engineer. And the state engineer has an application from the Water Authority for water rights and will be holding separate public hearings on that application beginning next month.

Second this meeting is not a debate. The first part of the meeting was designed to get your questions answered. This part of the meeting is about us sitting back and listening to what you have to say to help with this EIS. It's a formal public hearing in which each person who wants to make comments orally in a public forum is given the opportunity to do so. Your comments and questions will be captured by Debbie, our court reporter, verbatim and will be addressed in writing in the final environmental impact statement.

Please be aware if you ask a question while you're at the podium, we will note it into the record

and address it in the final EIS but we will not respond during the hearing. If you have a question during this hearing, you're very welcome to stand up, move to the back of the room, look for somebody that has a name tag like this (indicating) and they will help get your question answered.

2.2

We want to hear from everyone who has something to say tonight. As John said, we've allocated five minutes per person and he'll hold up some signs to help you manage your time. When you see the one that says time expired, please wrap up your comments.

If you have comments that you can't express in your five minutes, we would encourage you to please submit them in writing. They carry every bit as much weight as the comments made up here at the podium tonight.

We have extended the deadline for comments by 30 days. You now have until October 11th of 2011 to make comments, written or oral.

Regarding audience participation, please treat the speaker as you would like to be treated when it's your turn at the podium. Please don't interrupt the speaker, and please note that audience comments and/or reactions will not be part of the

transcript. We've had a couple of people in previous meetings ask the audience for responses about who's represented here or how do you feel, you're not obligated to respond to those speakers and they won't be part of the record.

1.3

2.2

And finally let me explain what happens from this point forward and then we'll turn it over to you. The comments you make here tonight, along with all the comments we've collected at the other public hearings and all the comments we receive in writing, will be used to develop the final version of this environmental impact statement. We expect to have that done and available for you to look at in mid 2012. It will include a comment response document that explains how we used all the comments we received.

When the final EIS is ready for release, a notice of availability will be published in the Federal Register, as well in local newspapers, and posted on the BLM website. A decision on that right-of-way application can be made any time 30 days after that notice of availability is published. A formal record of decision will be published in the Federal Register and local newspapers when that happens.

Finally I'd just like to extend my sincere thanks to all of you for being here tonight and being willing to participate in this process. I've worked on a lot of environmental impact statements in my 31 years with BLM and they're always better in the end for vigorous public review and comment, so thank you.

2.2

With that I'll ask John to please call our first speaker.

before, I will call the speakers up in the order that we received them or the order that people came in the door this evening. When you come up, I'm going to ask you to please spell your name and would you please give us your home mailing address so that we can have record of that.

Again we take speakers in the order in which they were received but we always defer to officials elected to public office, and we have one of those here tonight so I'm going to ask her to speak first.

Tonia Means. Miss Means, are you the chairman?

TONIA MEANS: Chairwoman.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: The chairwoman, excuse me, of the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe.

TONIA MEANS: Good evening, ladies and

gentlemen, my name is Tonia, it's T-o-n-i-a, last name is Means, M-e-a-n-s. The address is Number 1 Paiute Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89106. I come from the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe and our tribe is, you refer to as Tudinu, which means desert people.

1.3

2.2

First of all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be part of the administrative process of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1968 as amended for the draft environmental impact statement for the Southern Nevada Water Authority's application for the rights-of-way on the Southern Paiute Indian traditional homeland, which encompasses Clark, Lincoln and White Pine counties in Nevada.

Congress has mandated the Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management to grant Southern Nevada Water Authority a right-of-way grant in Clark County and Lincoln County and also White Pine for the construction and maintenance for a 300 mile plus subsurface pipeline on Southern Paiute traditional homeland administered by BLM as mandated in the Lincoln County Conservation, Recreational and Development Act of 2004. And prior to granting the SNWA the right-of-way grant, they would be subject to Congressional status and comply with those congressional statutes.

The concerns I have today is the draft environmental impact study failed to identify the legal questions concerning the multiple federally recognized tribes that have cultural ties to this region. For example, the federal government entered into treaties with tribes to allow non-Native Americans passage into tribes' traditional homelands but tribal leaders never, and the key word here is extinguished, our water rights to any federal government, agency or state government agency, nor has the United States Congress enacted laws transferring administrative authority to administrate Indian fiduciary trust assets to a state agency such as the Nevada State Water Engineer.

1.3

2.2

Federally recognized tribes maintain water as an Indian fiduciary trust asset, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs' responsibilities is to safeguard our trust assets. Prior to BLM moving forward with this proposed action, the United States Congress needs to address the Indian Fiduciary Trust Act Indian water right's legal question.

Nevada congressional representatives who initiated the LCCRDA failed to address Indian water right issues prior to proceeding with the provisions in the LCCRDA. It will take years for both the House

of Representatives and the Senate to initiate a bill to amend Indian water rights or a water settlement to the federally recognized tribes within the proposed project area.

2.2

But in the event BLM fails to address this legal question prior to the record of decision, tribes will appeal the BLM's ROD potential to the United States Court of Appeals in the Ninth Circuit.

Again, I appreciate the fact that I am able to stand here and bring this to your attention. I'm sure that there are landowners out there, ranch owners that this may affect. Well, it affects our people the same way that it's going to affect you, your private lands, your ranches and everything that may be included. I thank you very much for allowing me to speak and I hope that you all have a good evening. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Rob Mrowka.

ROB MROWKA: Good evening. My name is Rob Mrowka, it's spelled M-r-o-w-k-a. My address is 4261 Lily Glen Court in North Las Vegas, Nevada, and I'm representing the Center for Biological Diversity for whom I've worked as an ecologist, as well as the Great Basin Water Network on whose board I serve.

I first want to commend the Bureau of Land

Management for the wonderful job that they have done in the face of I'm sure much adversity in producing this draft environmental impact statement. The statement was probably six years or more in the making, and I'm sure it was very controversial throughout the course of making it. But in that document the BLM has redeemed its partial responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA. They have disclosed the biological and the social impacts of the project. We feel they have fallen short on disclosing the economic impacts, and I'll get into that shortly.

2.2

Unfortunately if you read the 2,000 pages of the draft environmental impact statement, along with the 3,000 pages of appendices, you will soon learn that life as we know it in eastern Nevada will be gone within a matter of decades. The heritage that is our national heritage of central and eastern Nevada, as well as western Utah, will be destroyed by this project despite statements by the Southern Nevada Water Authority to the otherwise.

If you read the document closely, you'll find out that almost 200,000 acres of our beloved Great Basin shrub land that provides habitat for mule deer, elk, pronghorn antelope, sage grouse, pygmy

rabbits and a number of other species will be destroyed and replaced by, quote/unquote, more dry species.

1.3

2.2

The Southern Nevada Water Authority, as part of their mitigation plan, says we're going to aerial seed dry land species to replace this very lush shrub land habitat that exists there now. There will not be any opportunities for your great, great grandchildren to hunt mule deer in this area impacted from the pumping.

Along with that, over 8,000 acres of wetlands is going to be destroyed. There is going to be over 120 miles of streams, including streams that are valuable for the Bonneville cutthroat trout, a species that is protected by the Endangered Species Act, will be negatively impacted by this pumping, along with 305 springs. Many of those springs are home to endemic spring snails and other aquatic species that are found nowhere else on Earth, and they too will go extinct if this project moves forward.

We're also concerned about the impacts to human health. You may realize in taking a look at the map that the basins that will be pumped dry are going to be -- the same basins that are downwind from

the Nevada Test Site, the site of over 200 nuclear explosions in the past, nucleoloids have been bound up in the soil and are being held in place by the soil and vegetation.

2.2

The draft environmental impact statement discloses, however, that over 34,000 tons of dust per year will be generated by the drying out of these groundwater basins. That in turn will release in that dust the radioactive nucleoloids as well as heavy metals that have the potential to be carcinogenic and create negative health consequences to those downwind and receiving the dust. The folks, our good friends in Utah, Salt Lake City, will be the primary benefactors of this aspect.

The Southern Nevada Water Authority has said previously this will not be an Owens Valley. Well, the environmental impact statement begs to differ.

The other thing that the environmental impact statement does is that it hypothetically places where the well sites are going to be located. The models for groundwater models are very specific to their impacts depending upon where the water is pumped. So rather than waiting for the state engineer's hearing to grant or not grant water rights, and for them to disclose where the well

locations are going to be precisely as part of this project, the BLM and SNWA have taken up a major guessing game on what the impacts will be.

1.3

2.2

in the draft environmental impact statement is only a guess and could be much worse. We feel that it ought to be delayed until the water rights are known and the exact well locations are known so proper modeling can be done of the environmental impacts. I mentioned previously that the --

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Mr. Mrowka, could you wrap up please.

ROB MROWKA: I mentioned previously that the draft environmental impact statement failed in one case, and that is to disclose the economic consequences of the action. Nowhere in the document will you find any cost estimate for the pipeline. We know that in the past it's been said to be \$3.5 billion several years ago. We're estimating that it's going to be many times that. And it's a case of the Southern Nevada Water Authority feeding at the trough of public funding. So for that reason alone we should say no to the pipeline, as well as the environmental reasons. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Danny Thompson.

I'm sorry, I can't read this, the Nevada State
AFL-CIO.

2.2

DANNY THOMPSON: Good evening. My name is Danny Thompson. I'm the executive secretary of the Nevada State AFL-CIO. D-a-n-n-y, T-h-o-m-p-s-o-n, 2057 Symphony Avenue, Henderson, Nevada 89052.

As a representative of the Nevada State AFL-CIO, which is comprised of 120 different organizations statewide with over 200,000 members, we're here today to support this project.

You know, the economic engine of this state is driven by Clark County. And anybody that knows anything about Nevada knows that the economy in Nevada is in shambles. The concern is without this project moving forward, the entire economy of the state of Nevada is at risk because unless Clark County recovers, with almost 50 percent of the state's money generated on the Las Vegas Strip, with that being in jeopardy, the state's economy will never recover.

So with that, I'm not going to take the five minutes, but we're very concerned that this project move forward, especially now given, you know, what's happened in this last legislative session where, you know, our number one industry has been devastated

with the recession. And if this drought continues, we would find ourselves in a place that we would not want to be. And so we urge the BLM to approve the preferred alternative, and that is to approve the right-of-way for this project. Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Buck Barber.

BUCK BARBER: My real name is Lannie, it's spelled L-a-n-n-i-e but I go by Buck Barber for most people. My address is 1401 Garnet place, that's G-a-r-n-e-t, and it's Boulder City, Nevada 89005.

I just want to say that I'm the president of Trout Unlimited. We have three to 400 members here locally. As a group we spent an astronomical amount of time up in the Great Basin area protecting the Bonneville cutthroat trout, helping with other projects concerning wildlife and whatnot up there and we've spent years and years. And we've been a group for 13, 14 years now and I think even towards the impact we've spend years trying to bring that place back to life again over the years that it's been decimated by a lot of different things.

The BLM scientists and resource experts and contract scientists that conducted the studies on impact and, you know, these people in their own words say that we don't know how much water there is. They

1 can't accurately say how much is available, or a lot 2 of these people can't say what the clear 3 environmental impact is on it. You know, I know 4 people have done impact statements on Owens Valley 5 and a lot of different areas, it's hard to call on 6 that but, you know, like I said, here's one of your 7 things in your own words, Groundwater: 8 difficult to see, measure or even locate it 9 accurately.

Another statement out here about your computer modeling which has the experts all in it, it says the computer model shows that groundwater levels will decline under all pumping alternatives.

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

So you're guaranteed a decline and a significant impact on the lands, that's the conclusion, and it's just this thing is unacceptable under those things.

Thousands of individuals and even well-intended government agencies like NDOW and a lot of other people, National Park Service up in Great Basin, all these people are against the draining of these waters in these valleys. These people live in these communities, they live up in the mountains, the people at Great Basin National Forest, they live there, they see what's going on.

Realistically the negative affects of proceeding with the withdrawal of water might not show for decades. Owens Valley is an example. It took 10 to 13 years before anybody really ever saw the impact of this and then it's too late. And now it will take centuries for it to recover, if that happens.

2.2

We can draw an acre this year and then we ask for two more acres next year, I'm talking about millions of acres of water feet, we ask for a little bit and look what we've done. We haven't done anything, we've drawn an acre. And then, well, we can do a couple more, because we asked for ten but we only asked for two and we get three, it doesn't sound so bad. But it takes decades for that impact to happen. All of a sudden two drought years and you've got the base trout, or whatever, you know the dace fish or whatever is up there is decimated. You don't get it back anymore. It's gone.

And it's nice to be optimistic about the issue, but the potential environmental impact to go forward isn't worth the risk. And for me I hate to see billions of dollars spent later to undo a wrong because, I mean, as a conservation organization we're a cold water conservancy. It says trout but we have

lots of fly fishermen and whatnot there. We have 150,000 or so members nationwide. We have three, 400 here.

2.2

If this gets in, years later now we're going to be spending millions of dollars to reverse this.

All we're going to have is a bunch of rusted pipeline up there if we find something that's -- some little critter out there that says, oh, it's gone, okay.

Well, we're going to have to protect that. It's not going to be there. So with that being said, a No Action is called for. And I thank you for letting me speak.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Hank Vogler.

HANK VOGLER: Hank Vogler, V-o-g-l-e-r, HCR 33 Box 33920, Ely, Nevada 89301.

I live in North Spring Valley. I find it quite incredulous or fortuitous that any biologist worth his onions can walk across my front yard and come up with half a dozen endangered species, a dozen endangered plants, animals, insects, reptiles. And we have a pipeline that's 300 miles long and there's no problem. No lizards, no sages, no problem. We can do it. That's pretty unbelievable. So if you think that's a little hypocritical, I do.

So we have to move on from that. We can't

predict what's going to happen until we put a hole in the ground and start pulling water out. I don't believe if you put a straw in a glass that the water on the bottom comes up without the water on the top falling.

2.2

We're going to have dust. We're going to have entire plant communities die. And most of all the one endangered species that you folks missed when you did your wonderful environmental impact statement was me. Sheep herders. There's only 12 of us left in the state. We've had a 97 percent reduction in our population of numbers. Should one sheep herder or 12 sheep herders in the state of Nevada stop Las Vegas? Absolutely not. But once you own 51 percent of the water rights in the basin, the other 49 percent have to go along no matter what.

Well, that's where we are. I'm collateral damage yet I'm the canary in the coal mine. It will be my sheep herder that comes off the mountain and says no puede, no water. We don't have any water up there. I can't do it. So how are we going to do it? How are we going to mitigate those kind of damages? There's nothing in here for the economic impact of me.

The Taylor Grazing Act, which was the father

of practically the BLM, was a bunch of ranchers that got together and said there was a finite amount of grass out there, a finite resource, so they got together and the BLM evolved out of the Taylor Grazing Act of 1934. And here we are. We have NEPA, we have FLPMA, we have acronym-itis with all the different acronyms that we use. But here we are. And we're going to have some more yet. And where are we getting?

2.2

If you look in the dictionary about cooperation, coordination, consideration and prior rights and prior this and prior right and custom and culture, you look all those things up, and I realize I only got through the sixth grade, however it was the six best years of my life, and you cannot do this without impacting, but you cannot just absolutely ignore the people that you're going to impact. You have got to step up. You've got to say, hey, we hope this will work. We hope if we go up there and have some PJ removal, take some Tamarisk off that drains into the Colorado, maybe do some desalinization.

You know, the first Ford car they ever built or the first automobile is not as handy as the one we have now. So if the more water you desalinate, the more chances you have in making it cheaper. But when

you drill that pipeline, the day you open that pipeline, if we go back to the same growth that we had in Las Vegas, the net gain to Las Vegas the day you cut the ribbon on the pipeline, you're out of water.

1.3

2.2

Can you go back to the Assembly and the Senate in Carson City and say, Doggone-it, we underestimated how much we could use? What do you think we ought to do? Spend 6 or \$7 billion to go to desalinization or spiderweb the rest of the 16 rural counties and take all the water, and then you split a little bit up with Reno and we'll void the entire basins of Nevada of the human element. For what?

There's a finite amount of water, and the last time I looked the Pacific Ocean was bigger than Cumins Lake. Cumins Lake is I think the biggest in White Pine County. But it looked a little bigger the last time I saw it.

So why don't we get real. If we're going to spend this kind of money, why don't we spend it on something that will create just as many jobs for you, sir, and your people, keep Vegas, the engine of Nevada, growing but also protect the second and third other industries in this state. The second industry

in this state is mining, the third industry is agriculture. And you're going to throw those out, completely away for a one horse town, a one horse show. And you don't have to do that. There are other ways to do it. And this is definitely not the way. And the taxpayers of this state and this nation should not have to pay for this absolutely Owens Valley on steroids. Thank you.

2.2

VINNY SPOTLESON: Hi. Vinny Spotleson,
V-i-n-n-y, S-p-o-t-l-e-s-o-n, 2638 Douglas Circle,
Henderson, Nevada 89074. Hi, my name is Vinny
Spotleson, I'm also a member of Sierra Club.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Vinny Spotleson.

When I was in elementary school my family moved to Henderson, and as a young child in the 1990s I can remember laws in front of every home, people watering in the hottest part of the summer and little creeks flowing down the gutters of almost every street.

Since then Southern Nevada Water Authority's Water Smart program has done amazing things from providing incentives that my parents used to xeroscape our lawn to implementing aggressive, smart drought restrictions that curb water usage in important ways as well as an advertising campaign to

educate the public on the importance of saving water.

2.2

What I didn't know as a kid, and what most people in Nevada don't know, is that the largest private landowner in the state is a multimillion dollar company called Vidler. And what does Vidler specialize in? Not oil, gold or gaming, but private water rights. Vidler buys water rights around Nevada, often from former agricultural grazing land, and converts that water into industrial use. With agricultural usage, some amount of water will return to the aquifer because most of the water is being used on site. But there's a problem when Vidler sucks water away from land often to cities' industrial uses where it gets burned in the air to create steam.

According to the overwhelming majority of the scientists, water vapor is in itself a mild greenhouse gas, and thus this use not only takes water out of the ground, springs, rivers and other down gradient users' wells but further perpetuates and accelerates global warming. And who is the main contractor of Southern Nevada Water Authority's at least \$3.2 billion pipeline? Well, this morning I called Dave Merril of Vidler water company and asked him what role the company will play in the

groundwater development program, and he refused to disclose anything about Vidler's role in the project.

1.3

2.2

But it is very clear from Vidler's website that the company has strategically acquired groundwater resources in the Dry Lake Valley and Lincoln County for beneficial use. What we have here is a massive transfer of wealth and resources, our dollars as water users in Southern Nevada, to one of the richest and best positioned corporations in the state.

Humans can live without electricity. We can go over a month without food but we cannot live more than a couple days, or down here a couple hours, without fresh water. This project helps take the most important resource of the world and further concentrates it in the hands of a private corporation which refuses to answer basic questions about what it's going to do with the water.

Southern Nevada Water Authority has many arguments as to why we need this pipeline. They say we are too dependent on a single source of water, but acknowledged that they can save more than 184,000 acre feet that this project would use through aggressive conservation programs. This is the driest desert in North America. We should have the

strongest building codes for water efficiency in North American.

1.3

2.2

They say that we need this water for our economic future but billions of gallons are still burnt in the air at giant fossil fuel power plants like Reid Gardner every year, while the operating of these power plants take our money through electricity bills instead of creating jobs in renewable energy.

And perhaps the most misguided and short-sighted claim that Southern Nevada Water
Authority uses is that investors and creditors are looking to see if we get this water in order to bring their money to Nevada. Southern Nevada Water
Authority made a lot of money during the boom by selling new hook-ups to home builders. They argue that this sort of growth can begin again if they get this water, as if investors in Wall Street firms are stupid enough to again start pouring their money into collateralized debt obligations, and credit defaults go up on sub-prime mortgage bonds in Las Vegas
Valley. That's not going to happen. That's the old economic paradigm, and look at what it resulted in.

Investors are looking at which communities are the most water efficient. They're searching for communities that still don't waste the majority of

their water on landscaping and fountains, communities that implement aggressive building codes and communities that find ways to stop defecating in the most precious resource in the world. Retrofitting old homes, businesses and toilets will create tons of jobs, millions nationwide.

1.3

2.2

Finally, the draft environmental impact statement, as they said, points out the disastrous effects that this project will have on the region. And this project is a great example of why we need the National Environmental Policy Act. It was designed to prevent projects like this from being built.

Please reject this project. Southern Nevada Water Authority has proven its ability to expand water saving renewable energy. They have proven that they know how to conserve massive amounts of water, and it will be very beneficial to our economy and our livelihood if we work with them to expand their conservation programs to distribute wealth and water instead of letting it further aggregate in the hands of Vidler. Please select the No Action alternative. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Sheila Stirling. SHEILA STIRLING: My name is Sheila Z.

Stirling, S-h-e-i-l-a, Z like zoo, Stirling, S-t-i-r-l-i-n-g, and I'm at 4132 South Rainbow Boulevard, Number 465, Las Vegas, Nevada 89103.

1.3

2.2

I'm part of the Climate Project and I speak about environmental impact. I don't have a lot of legal jargon today nor do I have a lot of political facts about this project, but what I do have is the right, no, I have the responsibility as a citizen to speak for those who have no voice. This groundwater grab project will negatively impact hundreds of miles of desert, the delicate balance between life and death for all plant life, and all animal life of the Nevada desert will be thrown from its natural course.

We don't have a water problem in this country, we have a distribution problem. Why don't we build a pipeline from the flooded Midwest, they're drowning out there. Why don't we build a pipeline from there to here? We'd be helping our neighbor states and we'd be helping Nevada.

Let's be smart and not destroy the desert ecosystem. Let's not turn the beautiful wild desert into a barren wasteland, because it's really time that we all think about sustainability and set aside greed and grab for higher earnings in the corporate end line.

Now it may sound very idealistic to you but if we drain this groundwater and kill the desert, we will not get a second chance to save this fragile and beautiful ecosystem. It's really time to become good custodians and move away from devouring and destroying everything we get near. Extinction is permanent. We must not let this project go forward. I vote no on this project. Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Max Chipman.

2.2

MAX CHIPMAN: My name is Max Chipman, that's M-a-x, C-h-i-p-m-a-n. I have two homes here in Nevada, one address is Post Office Box 50, Baker, Nevada; the other home is 951 Finchwood Lane, Las Vegas, Nevada 89110.

What I would like to address my little time here is there's three things that's very critical to me, to my health and to living here on Earth. One is the quality of food I eat, one is the quality of water I drink, and the other is the quality of air I breathe.

I am very, very, very concerned when you drain the water from my Baker, Nevada home and you create an Owens Valley or a Death Valley, then we have the problems we have there that we have in Las Vegas that I'm involved with. I'm in environmental

testing, that's my business here in Las Vegas. And our bad air days here in Las Vegas is dust related.

1.3

2.2

In Baker, Nevada, I don't have dust related problems. But if you take that water and create an Owens Valley, create a Death Valley up there, yes, I will have dust problems. And it will be, I'm sure you have seen on television here three or four weeks ago that dust storm in Phoenix where everybody was demanded to stay inside, not to go outside and breathe the air. That storm didn't come from lush landscaping, it came from the desert. It came from deserts like the Owens Valley and the Death Valley. That's what we must eliminate.

Now as a businessman here in Vegas there's no question we do need water for our growth. We need to bring more water into Las Vegas so that the Southern Nevada Water Authority can pump more water down the Sloan drainage ditch so that they can create more mosquitoes, more bugs that bite and create a problem.

Now it is true that we do need some water.

As I talked with one gentleman earlier today, all I ever hear about is the water coming down the Colorado River. That is our water that we use here. My question is is that the only place we get the water?

I am originally from Utah. If you've never made the friendship cruise down the Green River, up the Colorado River, then you'll have no idea how much water is there. Maybe 40 percent of the water coming down the Colorado River comes down the Green River.

2.2

Where is the headwaters of the Green River?
The headwaters of the Green River is within 30,
40 miles of the headwater of the Clear River, the
headwaters of the Jackson Hole River and the
headwaters of the Columbia River. That is excess
water running to the ocean that should be then moved
down to Las Vegas.

excess water to be pumped down here and wasted in the Sloan drainage ditch. Excessive water runs to the ocean. We do not have any water in that area running to the ocean. What we need to do is take a look at, really fast, like the headwaters of the Green River, which fill Flaming Gorge. I water skied on Flaming Gorge. It's at huge facility. At the moment it's full. I don't see a Pat Mulroy walking around saying how low Flaming Gorge is.

I just think that we need to take a look at what's going on. We really need to take a look at the infrastructure that we have in the water here in

the country and redo the water so that we have it where we need it. And I thank you for allowing me to voice my opinion. And let me tell you, water is critical. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Pat Brunson.

PAT BRUNSON: My name is Pat Brunson,
B-r-u-n-s-o-n. I live at 879 Ripple, R-i-p-p-l-e,
Way, Las Vegas, Nevada 89110.

There's an inadequate analysis in the report of the actual costs of the pipeline including the sources of funding. By the way, I am an advocate in Food and Water Watch, which is how I got involved with this.

The Southern Nevada Water Authority is pushing the project to be approved but they can't tell where the \$3 billion budget for this project will come from. Some portion of this will have to come from public funding, which will eventually mean higher bills for ratepayers and taxpayers in the state. This will undoubtedly have a disproportionate impact on low income communities in Las Vegas.

Why isn't a physical analysis included in the DEIS? And I am a low income person that will be heavily impacted with this. My 20-year-old disabled daughter and I live on \$126 a month. I can barely

afford the water that I pay for now.

2.2

What is the purpose and need of this enormous project if Las Vegas can't even adequately manage its own water supply? Water conservation measures in this city have been inefficient. Two weeks ago I called, I live in a housing complex that I rent at, I called the water department, I called my homeowners association and we called -- we all called the water department for about 15 to 20 calls that somehow never got on the books for a seepage in my street in the complex that turned out to be a lake last Monday.

Last Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday the water department finally came out to fix the problem, but when they fixed one portion, the next portion broke. And we're still waiting for the rest of it to break because the builders built it cheap. They got jobs but we have to pay for the end result.

The DEIS is a highly technical document with more than 1200 pages, and more than 2,000 pages if you include appendices. The agency had more than six years to prepare this document, yet only four months of approval time have been granted to review the project. Will the BLM extend the comment period to allow a full six-month review?

Also there could be drops in the water table as much as ten feet or more in many parts of Nevada. This means that any vegetation that has shallow roots would wither and die, and with them many creatures, large and small, who depend on this vegetation for food, shelter and water will die. This could result in a huge dustbowl impact throughout Northern Nevada and even parts of Utah.

1.3

2.2

This massive project will have a major human impact. Families who depend on well water may find that their well has gone dry when the water table drops. Local businesses and Native American communities will suffer, and ranchers may lose their livelihoods.

I urge the BLM to support a No Action alternative which is the only option that will not have a harmful impact on the diversity and productivity of public lands. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Dundee Jones.

DUNDEE JONES: Dundee Jones, D-u-n-d-e-e,
J-o-n-e-s. I live at 433 Summit Drive, Henderson,
Nevada. That's S-u-m-m-i-t, Summit Drive, and 89002.

And I'm here today representing selfishly myself as a trout fisherman, as a trout fisherman and a visitor to much of the areas that this will have

impact on. And I just wanted to give a little firsthand experience of what I have seen up there. And I know how delicate the water table is because I have been there from one week to the next, I've been there from the beginning of the season to the end of the season and I see that water fluctuate as the farmers just use it to irrigate their fields. So I know that that is very delicate up there.

1.3

2.2

And I also want to give some credit to Pat Mulroy from this article that was in the RJ that says, I will quote this, She had an idea that borders on zany. A massive Public Works proposal to divert water from flood stricken regions of the Midwest to aquifers as far west as Colorado so that they may be tapped by people who draw from the Colorado River basin. That strategy would allow others, including Southern Nevadans, to get more water out of the river.

And it was a zany -- it was a doosy of an idea when she suggested that, and the idea is to build diversion damns from the floor control and move the water to aquifers beneath the farmlands of Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas to Colorado. If Colorado farmers can't use it, then we can just drain more off of that for Nevada and downstream.

But the way it's going on now, it doesn't sound good. And I have respect for the people in the north. I side with them that this is not a good idea. It's a good idea to plan for water for our growth in the future, but this is not the best way to do it. I think this is a zany idea but it's meritorious, and there should be some research done on following up on this idea as well as the desalinization.

2.2

So I'd like to see the Bureau of Land

Management do more in that regard. I do like your

posters around because you have indicated there are

negative impacts, and that is what I think most

people here today are here for. So we vote against

it. That's fly fishermen avid enthusiasts. I'm also

a member of Trout Unlimited and the Fly Fishing

Federation.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Mandi Lindsay.

MANDI LINDSAY: Good evening. I'm Mandi
Lindsay representing the Associated General
Contractors of Las Vegas. My name is spelled
M-a-n-d-i, L-i-n-d-s-a-y. My address is 8835 Chapman
Point, Las Vegas, Nevada.

As I stated earlier, I'm here on behalf of the Associated General Contractors of Las Vegas and

would like to express our support of the Southern

Nevada Water Authority's groundwater development

project. There is no question that Southern Nevada's

construction industry must have a reliable and

dependable water supply.

1.3

2.2

For the past decade we've witnessed the adverse effects of drought and realize how important it is for Southern Nevada to protect itself from drought conditions. Beneath this project is severe economic and social consequences that could occur in Southern Nevada should the groundwater development project not proceed are enormous.

Southern Nevada, as it's been stated earlier, is Nevada's economic engine. It must be stressed that this engine cannot drive new economic development opportunities benefitting the entire state without the precious resource of water. I urge the BLM to permit the Southern Nevada Water Authority's groundwater development project to move forward by granting its right-of-way. The Las Vegas construction industry, the Southern Nevada community, and the broader state depend on this project. So I trust that a fair decision will be made to ensure that Nevada will be able to prosper in the future. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Brian McAnallen.

2 BRIAN MCANALLEN: Brian McAnallen,

 $3 \quad M-c-A-n-a-l-l-e-n$, 2822 Glen Court, Las Vegas, 89135.

4 I'm the vice president of government affairs for the

5 Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce and I'm here on behalf

of our 6,000 member businesses, thousands of small,

7 | medium and large companies that employ over 230,000

8 Nevadans.

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I'm here to state the chamber support of the Southern Nevada Water Authority to obtain rights-of-way across land managed by the BLM. The chamber has traditionally supported long-term and short-term supply augmentation and planning for water delivery systems and sources and how to meet the anticipated future water needs of the Las Vegas Valley.

The availability and sustainability of resources for quality water are essential to our residents. And beyond the importance of water to all of us as residents, the business community relies on adequate and stable water supplies for operations and development in order to support a vital economy.

If granted, the rights-of-way will support the development of unused groundwater, and this water is needed for Southern Nevada Water Authority to

diversify its water resources, ensure existing and projected future water demands are met.

2.2

Southern Nevadans have answered the call already to conserve and have decreased our water dependency by a third. And while we've had one good year of snow pack, that doesn't ensure a permanent, adequate supply of water. We need to prepare for the delivery system needs of tomorrow for our community, and that's good public policy.

The economic slowdown over the past few years has been especially challenging for businesses in the state of Nevada, and we need to have a dependable, sustainable water supply, and that's a key to our economic recovery and attracting new investment in Nevada.

And I'd just like to point out that this is one issue where the business community and the union organizations stand firmly together in support of this. We need to do everything we can to help our economy rebound and flourish again, and this sustainable delivery of water system is the way to help that happen.

Please consider the extent and scope of the negative economic impact that would take place with residents and businesses if Clark County does not

1 have reliable access to water. Thank you.

2.2

2 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Dean Baker.

DEAN BAKER: Dean Baker, Baker Ranch, Baker,

Nevada 89311, Box 10.

My main point tonight is to say that I believe the BLM is not looking at their history, the history of Department of Interior. BLM is the Bureau of Land Management, the creation of the land for putting agriculture and livestock, particularly the BLM, Taylor Gazing Act, to make it so it was usable and productive in my life.

In World War II I've been very connected watching the BLM make us more productive, taking better care of the land and do it.

Now when you say that it is the state engineer's only thing to take care of the water things, your job has been to take care of the land, to save the land. Now if you allow this pipeline, you're ruining the land. So does that satisfy your history as the creation of your land agency? I do not think it will. My experience says that that is as wrong as it can be. You may not think you should control the water, but the pipeline kills the land, the livestock and things.

One of the things that it helped was get it

so that this small percentage in the United States pays for its food is because of the productivity of agricultural lands in this country. But to do that you can't take the water away from the land and do it.

1.3

2.2

One of the things that I'm most bothered by is looking at your book in this section here where it shows the drawdown levels. Your drawdown levels for Snake Valley show essentially there is very little affect, zero affect. But let me tell you about our experience in Snake Valley. One of the real simple ones is the Needlepoint well or Needlepoint Spring. It was created years ago, or it was not created, it was there when I first came to that area. The three Cs in the depression put the water in the good facilities. No one there has any memory of it not being there.

In 2001 there was a development of water in that area from some other old land that was never productive. What that did was draw this spring down below the level where that spring no longer ran. Seventeen wild horses were killed on that. That developer developed the water on that land so he could sell it to Southern Nevada Water Authority.

Baker Ranch has developed and pumped water.

It draws down water. We have dried up springs and other things. Our neighbors have dried up springs and other things, so we watch that very clearly. So to put in this book that nothing has to be considered until you have a ten-foot drawdown.

2.2

Now we talked about the Burbank Meadows.

The Burbank Meadow is right below that Needlepoint

Springs. What is the Burbank Meadow? It was a place

first settled by white man. But what happened before

white man got there or when he got there? It was

totally covered with the Indians living in that area.

There was fish. There were wildlife of all kinds.

There was plants growing. So it was very productive

for the Indians and the many that lived there.

Now this Needlepoint Spring development of water that's right above there, Needlepoint Springs is one of the things, has the same test of water ingredients and whatnot that's coming out of the spring that serves the Burbank Meadows.

Burbank Meadows are home for about 2,000 mother cows and their calves raising them through the summer now. It also produces other things. That spring drying up means it's taking water from there also. Those pumps are also lowering the Needlepoint Springs. When they talk about the ten foot drawdown

1 being where, they have to look at things. 2 Burbank Meadows, if you go there in the summer, there 3 are solid grass growing all over the meadow and 4 everything. The cows are living off of it. But when 5 the fall comes, and you take the cows off and we 6 don't spread the water on it, it just flows. 7 water comes to the surface and it gets totally covered with ice because of the water coming. 8

That area has been an area where the white man has been. For instance, the Donner family, who still own part of it, came there, first listed in Millard County Courthouse as coming in 1862. So that was created and used for long before there was states of Nevada or Utah, and those rights are all things that will be taken away and destroyed with the drawdown.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Irene Porter.

18 Miss Porter, are you here?

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Virginia Valentine.

VIRGINIA VALENTINE: I'm Virginia Valentine, V-a-l-e-n-t-i-n-e. My address is P.O. Box 81526, Las Vegas, Nevada 89180. I am with the Nevada Resort Association.

I think as others have said, and I think you all know, that tourism-related businesses make up the

largest sector of Nevada's economy. In addition to being the state's largest employer, the industry is also the state's largest tax contributor. By just about every measure: Jobs, tax revenue, capital investment, the casino industry does provide the state with a great deal of economic benefit.

1.3

2.2

Southern Nevada's economy is dependent on the hotel, gaming and convention industry, and the viability of the Clark County economy is dependent on the volume of visitors to the region. A water shortage in Southern Nevada would have a devastating impact on the gaming and resort industry as well as the state economy. That's why the Nevada Resort Association fully supports the Southern Nevada Water Authority's groundwater development project, and we feel that while the draft environmental impact statement does address some of the economic impacts to Lincoln and White Pine, we are concerned that it doesn't address the ramifications in Clark County on the economy should the project not go forward.

We believe that the SNWA should be allowed to secure the rights-of-way from the Bureau of Land Management, and thank you for the opportunity to make these comments to you this evening.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Brian Unguren. I

hope I'm pronouncing that correctly.

2.2

BRIAN UNGUREN: Yeah, that's right. My name is Brian Unguren, U-n-g-u-r-e-n. Address is 518

Primrose Hill Avenue, Las Vegas 89178. I'm here today speaking as a private citizen. I'm an active community member, a homeowner and a longtime resident of Southern Nevada. And I've actually followed this issue quite closely for some time now and I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak on it.

It's been stated several times tonight, we all know that Clark County is the economic engine of this state. I think we contribute around 70 or 80 percent to the state's budget. And everyone also knows that the water in this state belongs to the people in the state, not the people just in the county where the water is located.

So essentially my family and I have lived here in Clark County for quite some time and we have just as much right to the water as the people who live in White Pine or Lincoln counties. And from what I understand, they have no plans to put that water to use. They just don't want us to have it for whatever reason.

As someone who pays taxes in Clark County, it amazes me that people in the rural counties who

benefit from my tax dollars are complaining so much about sending water where it is needed most. If Clark County were to run out of water, the impacts would be felt across the entire state, especially the rural counties. People also say that when Las Vegas gets water from up north, it will dry everything up in those valleys, the only problem is they don't have any evidence that this will actually happen. Their trivial concerns are based upon emotion and rhetoric.

I see the comments made in the articles and on the message boards, and I can't believe the amount of disdain that they have for Southern Nevadans just because we live in Las Vegas and Henderson and Boulder City. People in Clark County also love this state and this country and should be allowed to use water that isn't being used to support our economy. Please don't forget that not building the project will have a huge impact on this state, and the BLM needs to take that into consideration when they issue their decision. Thank you again for allowing me to comment.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Steve Rypka.

STEVE RYPKA: Hello, my name is Steve Rypka, that's R-y-p-k-a, 2194 Clearwater Lake Drive,

Henderson, Nevada 89044.

1.3

2.2

And there's no lake on my street, even though it's named that way. The reason I mention that because it's common that a lot of developers in Southern Nevada like to name places after things that we all like, like lakes and rivers and so forth, because we value that as human beings. We value the natural world and what it represents. It's our heritage. The Earth is our one true home and we need to honor that.

1.3

2.2

You know, a city like Las Vegas is here because of some amazing engineering feats but we actually did a really good job in creating Lake Mead and I think that we have a right to use that water efficiently. We're not really using it efficiency. We can do a lot more with what we have. And I think it's a really big mistake to look at expanding the footprint of Las Vegas ever outward taking additional resources from people and other living things that are already living in harmony with those resources. It's just a moral mistake. It is the wrong thing to do.

So in case you don't know where I'm going with this, I'm definitely in favor of the No Action option. I want to be clear on that before I forget.

You know, we have so much ability here to

create. Las Vegas is known for being very innovative. We reinvented ourselves many times. You know, the business community, the contractors, the labor forces want to see economic activity. That's important. We need a strong economy but there are other ways to do that.

1.3

2.2

If we continue on the path that we're looking at doing this pipeline, that's kind of like using the same logic that got us into a problem in the first place. What if we looked at going in the other direction towards a sustainable option where we use, if we're going to spend money, let's use it to seed start-up businesses to create innovation, real change in how we use water effectively and efficiently.

We could create new businesses, we could create new industries, we could become a leader in a global crisis and address a real need around the world and start exporting the knowledge and the innovations that we come up with here and become known as a center for water efficiency. That's what I would propose to address the economic issue, and at the same time we allow our natural systems to continue to thrive and maintain the balance that they've had for hundreds of thousands of years.

It honors the native people and their lands. We don't have to step on any toes by expanding our footprint. You know, if every city continues to expand its footprint, pretty soon we're all stepping on each others toes.

2.2

Now the other thing that I'm not clear about in the draft EIS, because I haven't read every page of it, is are we looking at the economic and environmental impacts of the actual city of Las Vegas in the long term, because sustainability is all about looking at long-term, thriving and survivability. I mean, what would the impact be, for example, if we went ahead with this project? We know it's going to drive growth, it's going to drive short-term profits for a few industries, for a few companies, for some businesses. Yeah, it will be great for a while.

And let's say that that growth results in a valley full of five million people instead of two million, and now what if we, you know, made the mistake, actually it's not even a mistake because we know in the EIS report it says it's going to draw down the water, so eventually that's not a sustainable resource. It's a desert. There's not an unlimited water supply laying around under the ground in Nevada.

So down the road, 20 years, 30 years or a hundred years, that water supply runs out, but we've got millions more people here. What is the impact of the decisions that we make now on future generations? We're only going to give them a bigger problem to deal with in the future. That is not a sustainable option.

2.2

So I think the only real option that makes sense, as human beings, from a moral standpoint, from an economic standpoint, and just to look at living, you know, leaving a legacy for future generations that we can all live with, is to take the No Action option. Thank you very much.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Wayne Bliss.

WAYNE BLISS: My name is Wayne Bliss, that's B-1-i-s-s. Ignorance is bliss. 5459 Evelyn Street, Las Vegas, 89120.

The No Action alternative in this EIS is the only justifiable position that we can take. This project is flat wrong. Should never been in.

Nevada Test Site is probably the most studied hydrological area in this country and we don't know what's happening with the water up there. So regardless of all the beautiful computer models, I don't think they tell us the true picture. This is

merely a water grab to sustain the growth of Las Vegas.

1.3

2.2

Las Vegas is a city that has no basis for existence. It's not an agricultural town, it's not a seaport, it's not a mining town. The only thing we do here is mine people's pocketbooks, and that is not a sustainable situation. We can take the last speaker's option and we cut off gaming, okay, but what would happen to us then?

Agriculture in the basins that we're talking about here sustains the livestock industry now and some mining. Most of that production is to support livestock and to feed pet horses, for those in town who have horses. I suggest that the acres and the water that is there now and supports the livestock industry that's for human consumption may in the future.

The models here trying to reach out 200 years, within that 200 years we may well need those acres and that water to produce food for the human base, and that's well within the term of the project. If this project goes ahead, depletes those water supplies, those water supplies can't be used to raise crops and five million people in Las Vegas can starve. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Larry McCormick.

2 LARRY MCCORMICK: My name is Larry

3 McCormick. I reside at 7513 Radville,

1.3

2.2

4 R-a-d-v-i-l-l-e, Drive, Las Vegas, Nevada 89129.

I'm here today representing myself, my family, my friends, and Trout Unlimited. I've been on the board of Trout Unlimited, Southern Nevada chapter of Trout Unlimited for pretty much probably 11 of the 13 years that Lannie talked about and I've been on the state board of Trout Unlimited when it existed.

I'm here today to express my concerns about the impact this SNWA groundwater pumping will create on the Great Basin area. I, along with many other volunteers from many different groups, have given thousands of hours of our time over the last ten years to help in the reintroduction of the native Bonneville cutthroat trout in the Great Basin National Park and surrounding areas. These groups include Southern Nevada Trout chapter of Trout Unlimited, National Trout Unlimited, members of the Las Vegas and Henderson Fire Departments, Ducks Unlimited, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Mule Deer Foundation, along with many others and many other concerned citizens of Southern and Central Nevada.

We've raised money to buy equipment for studying fish habitat and fish genetics. We've spent many trips to areas assisting national park employees gather macro-invertebrate information for studies prior to the reintroduction of the Bonneville cutthroats. We participated in water sampling and testing, we've helped in fish surveying and provided some of the funds to do the genetic testing on fish to determine their pureness of strain.

1.3

2.2

After many years of surveys, tests and studies, it was found that Mill Creek in Great Basin National Park indeed has a pure strain of native Bonneville cutthroats. Some of those fish were later introduced into streams where they had been wiped out by floods or other natural disasters. One example of this is South Fork of the Big Wash Creek. Other Bonneville cutthroats were reintroduced into such streams as Strawberry Creek, the South Fork, the Baker and Snake Creek where man's earlier blunders had wiped them out almost to extinction.

It was thought that not nonnative fish could survive along with native fish and provide better fishing for anglers. After it's too late we learned that these nonnative fish that we artificially induced decimated the populations of the native

Bonnevilles to extinction in those streams. It's hard enough to help them survive natural disasters without introducing man-made disasters.

1.3

2.2

I personally hiked into and observed some of these natural springs in this area that creates the streams that these fish now live in. These springs and creeks are a beautiful sights to see in person, and those that haven't visited, you should, it's a great resource here in our local state.

These springs only provide enough water to create small streams. They're dependent on underground aquifers, rainwater, rainfall and snowfall. We all know that the amount of rain and snowfall has been at drought stages over the last eight to ten years so they now depend on existing aquifers more than ever. These springs will dry up if the aquifers are depleted. These springs will dry up without these natural springs, and the native Bonneville cutthroat will die without sufficient water in these streams.

I've heard SNWA say there's enough water to go around, yet they cannot get ranchers to share their water rights so they've had to pay exorbitant amounts to buy out ranches. Why? Because the ranchers know that once the water is piped out, they

will not have enough water to support their livestock and sustain their ranches. SNWA can assure us all they want but what if they're wrong?

1.3

2.2

Other areas in the western United States have been given similar assurances only to find aquifers dry up enough that the land cannot sustain normal plant, stock and wildlife. If they're wrong will they be around to acknowledge they mislead the public for financial gain? If they're wrong will they agree to stop pumping before they've completely wiped out the area? If they're wrong will they be able to explain to my children, your children and our grandchildren why they ruined one of Nevada's oldest living native species, the Bonneville cutthroat trout?

and too many dollars, have done all the work to restore and enhance the native Bonneville cutthroat populations in the Great Basin area to go to waste by letting the SNWA steal their water. I've only touched on this one area of concern is the one I'm most familiar with and the one my friends, family and children have spent the most time trying to save. There are other areas that I'm sure will be greatly affected also: Lehman Caves and other surrounding

cave systems, whose creation and stunning features are formed by underground flows of water, the many different species of plants, birds, wildlife who depend on the water supply, the farmers, the ranchers and all the other people who have economic impact in that area.

1.3

2.2

The national park system was put into place so man couldn't ruin some of the natural wonders that exist in the United States of America. Let us not introduce any other man-made disasters that will cause more stress and harm to these areas. Please do not let man and SNWA take a chance at ruining two of our natural treasures: Great Basin National Park and the native Bonneville cutthroat trout. Please choose the No Action alternative for this EIS and keep the pipelines away from Great Basin National Park, Spring and Snake Valleys and the White Pine County.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Launce Rake; is that correct?

LAUNCE RAKE: Launce Rake, L-a-u-n-c-e, R-a-k-e. I'm an independent consultant. I'm the board member of the Toiyabe chapter of Sierra Club and I work with several other environmental groups, including the Great Basin Water Network.

I want to note real briefly that I stood

with my brothers and sisters in the union movement many times and I'm proud to do so; however, in this case I have to say that I strongly support the No Action alternative. I don't think that carving up and selling off or trading off our heritage, our environmental heritage and our recreational heritage is worth what is referred to as several hundred jobs to build a pipeline that we don't need.

1.3

2.2

The reason we just don't need it is because we have an utterly reliable source of water right now. We have the Colorado River. The Colorado River is a strong river. The only reason it's in danger is because of overuse, and not by Las Vegas but by other consumers along the river.

However, what we have been able to do in Las Vegas, and this speaks to the testament of our community and our strength of community, it speaks also to hard work by my friends at the Southern Nevada Water Authority is we have cut a third of our use. We have a huge margin now of a hundred thousand acre feet a year that can supply growth, other needs, and we can continue that conservation and cut a lot more water from our use here, our use profile in Las Vegas.

And that's what we should be doing instead

of looking to rural Nevada to destroy rural economies, Native American communities, endangered species in a great part of the United States. This is an area the size of Vermont that we're talking about wrecking, so I think's that's very important to note.

1.3

2.2

The other point that I wanted to make is that the BLM has done a very good job of cataloging the potential impacts of this project. I really appreciate that work and I appreciate the opportunity to speak today.

I do think that there is one very important deficiency that should be addressed. Popular media accounts and conversations that I've had personally with Pat Mulroy I referred to the relationship between the Southern Nevada Water Authority and the development of a huge housing project on the Lincoln/Clark County line called Coyote Springs development, Coyote Springs investment project.

We're talking about 150,000 homes that would be built with nonunion labor up there.

The relationship between the water agency and Coyote Springs investment is very close. In fact, SNWA has paid Coyote Springs investment tens of millions of dollars in an ongoing contractual

partnership with this developer. I'm concerned that one of the primary movers for this particular project is actually the relationship with Coyote Springs, and I think that that needs to be addressed within the EIS. So I would hope that the BLM would reference that, and again I thank you for your time.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Helen Foley.

HELEN FOLEY: Good evening. My name is
Helen Foley and I live at 888 Pinehurst Drive, Las
Vegas, Nevada. I am a native Las Vegan but I'm a
fourth generation Nevadan. My father's grandfather
and his father came to Goldfield at the turn of the
century when mining was quite active.

My mother's side of the family, her mother is from Bunkerville, Nevada, just on our northern border here, and her father is from Lincoln County and moved to Lincoln County, her great grandfather moved to Lincoln County in 1864. So I am very familiar with Nevada and I love it.

Tonight I am representing Pardee Homes who has been building homes in Southern Nevada, approximately 40,000 homes since 1952, so almost 60 years of actively supporting, working and caring deeply about Southern Nevada. We support the SNWA and their groundwater development project.

the Colorado River, it is not reliable, especially when we have ten years of drought. I think the people to blame right now for all of this are our representatives in the 1920s who sold us very short on water. Only 300,000 acres feet was given to Nevada, but then I suppose because we had not invented air conditioning yet. A lot of people couldn't imagine that anyone would actually live here. But we are really the only community of all the seven western states that are right on the Colorado River and it has created many, many problems for us.

1.3

2.2

Ten years ago we had no idea that we would be in such a drought stricken situation. But it's very scary, and even last year we were just within a few feet of having to do some very draconian measures so that we could turn on our tap water. We believe that the Southern Nevada Water Authority's groundwater development project assures water availability for current and future demands and provides the necessary protection from drought conditions.

Now we know that when we've had these hearings before that there's a strong management

procedure that will be in place. SNWA will implement numerous monitoring procedures to determine whether and how to implement additional environmental protection measures working very closely with federal, state and local agencies. That strong management is what will safeguard the environment in Eastern Nevada.

1.3

2.2

I was thrilled that the gentleman talked about the zany idea that Mrs. Pat Mulroy has about getting water from flood stricken areas, but that's not the only zany idea she has had. And I have really got to congratulate her. For many, many years those that worked on the Colorado River were just suing each other and nothing was happening, and she got together with her colleagues and has made some very, very strong strides forward, reaching international agreements with Mexico and still working very hard to see how we might desalt some of that Pacific Ocean.

If you think that Mr. Baker is difficult up north, it's nothing like trying to get desalt facilities right off the coast of Carlsbad. It's almost impossible to do that. California is just saying no. But that's not stopping Mrs. Mulroy. From what we understand they might be doing some down

in Mexico. But we can't wait for that.

2.2

And as far as inter-basin transfers, some of our communities like Carson City and Tonopah were all built because they had the inter-basin transfers.

This is nothing new for Nevada. Nevada's water belongs to Nevadans, and so therefore for these reasons we endorse the SNWA development project, and please, we request that the right-of-way to develop this be utilized. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: John Hiatt.

JOHN HIATT: My name is John Hiatt, that's spelled H-i-a-t-t. I live at 8180 Placid Street, Las Vegas, 89123. I'd like to thank the BLM for this opportunity to speak tonight about this important project.

basically kicked the can down the road and did not worry about what future generations would have to live off of or the problems they would have to deal with because of what current generations did with regard to natural resources. Fortunately about 40 years ago the National Environmental Policy Act was passed by Congress and that directed federal agencies to actually make real studies of what happened on projects proposed for federal land so the

decision makers would actually know the impacts of those projects and what those impacts would have on future generations.

2.2

I congratulate the BLM on this particular document. I think it is very good. I think it fairly lays out the impacts. The point of this exercise is to determine whether the BLM will issue a right-of-way. And that's somewhat complicated by the Lincoln County Land Conservation Act of 2004 which actually directed them to issue a right-of-way in Clark and Lincoln counties.

The document states that this is really not a point of decision for them, that it's mandated. I think that is not a point of settled law. That needs to be mentioned in the final document, that there's a conflict between FLPMA, the Federal Land Policy Management Act, which established the BLM which mandates sustainable use of our federal lands, and the 2004 Lincoln County Act, which basically directs them to issue the right-of-way regardless of what the consequences are.

In White Pine County there is no such directive and the BLM is free to make a decision either to approve one of the alternatives or the No Action alternative. I would strongly urge them to

take the No Action alternative. The consequences, the long-term consequences of this project are pretty evident from the studies.

2.2

In Southern Spring Valley we would see potentially greater than 200 foot drawdown in the water table over the next 75 years. That basically means the end of all of the vegetation in that valley with significant loss not only of wildlife, so on, but very negative consequences in terms of turning that into a dustbowl. And those are things that the BLM is mandated by the act of 1976 which created the agency to address.

So to reiterate, I strongly urge you to pick the No Action alternative but also to have a discussion in the final document about the conflict between the 1976 organic act for BLM, which mandates sustainable development, and the 2004 Lincoln County Land Act, and hopefully deny or pick the No Action alternative for the entire project. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Howard Watts.

HOWARD WATTS: All right. Good evening. So for the record my name is Howard Watts, H-o-w-a-r-d, W-a-t-t-s. And I reside at 7716 Custom Weave Court, Las Vegas, Nevada 89149. It's one of those funky subdivision names.

I'm here today representing the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada and don't intend to use all my time. So first I'll get right to the point. We absolutely support the No Action alternative in regards to how the BLM should move forward on this.

2.2

And in terms of other people who have spoken in favor of that alternative, we just kind of want to second a lot of those opinions. We think that you should look more into some of the economic impacts that the pipeline may have.

And we encourage you to extend the period for comments and feedback because this is going to have long lasting repercussions, and the longer that we have to gain input and criticism for this project, the stronger that the final EIS will be and the stronger the decision made as a result will be.

You know, there's only a couple other points

I want to bring up. One is that a couple of speakers

that came up here didn't seem to have a really good

grasp on water rights and water law. The phrase that

Nevada's water belongs to all of Nevada or belongs to

Southern Nevada isn't true. Nevada's water belongs

to the people that have the rights to that water.

And those water rights can be problematic at times. It's not a perfect system. But in this case

and in some cases it's all that is keeping some of these rural ranchers, it's all that's keep some of these underrepresented interests from having a way to contest this pipeline, which is going to have, which the draft EIS has shown is going to have really significant impacts in these valleys.

1.3

2.2

And the other thing that I wanted to say is that, you know, as some other speakers have mentioned, the BLM was created, along with several other agencies, as a steward for public lands, to preserve these lands, to make sure that they're used but that they're used in a sustainable manner so that certain elements of them can be enjoyed and used in recreational ways for generations to come.

And so that's why the No Action alternative is the only alternative that the BLM should pursue because any other alternative that allows for pumping of the water from these valleys is going to result in destruction of that land, and even acts to try to remediate that or mitigate that after the fact is not going to return the Great Basin to the greatness that it has right now.

So once again, I urge the BLM to address some of these concerns, extend the comment period, and at the end of the day deny the right-of-way to

the Southern Nevada Water Authority. Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Linda Schmidt.

LINDA SCHMIDT: Hi, my name is Linda

Schmidt, S-c-h-m-i-d-t. My address is Post Office

Box 237 in Blue Diamond, 89004.

I am speaking for myself and I'm a volunteer with Food and Water Watch. I'm concerned about this project because of the impact that it will have.

First of all, I don't think that we have done enough with water conservation in this city and in this state. I have children in Oregon, and everybody knows how much rainwater there is in Oregon, yet the people in Oregon do not waste water. They have very strict guidelines.

The second point is I request that the BLM extend the comment time. This is such a huge document and very complicated, and I really very much appreciate the public opportunity to speak and to study and think about this, but I think we need a little more time.

I'm also concerned about the rights of the underrepresented faction in the state: The indigenous people, the wildlife. The wildlife and the natural areas are for all of us to enjoy, and when we destroy a large portion of the state, we have

1 lost something very valuable for everyone.

2 And I heard the comment made by

3 Mr. McAnallen that there's unused water in Baker.

4 | Well, I am sure that the Baker area is making very

5 good use of their water, and I'm sure that there's

6 | wildlife and plant life that's using the water, and I

7 | don't think that we need to rob it from them.

I also heard the comment that we need to protect Southern Nevada from drought. Well, I would like to protect Southern Nevada from drought but I'm not in favor of doing it at the expense of everyone else, so I would urge the BLM to support a No Action alternative. Thanks.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Jayne Feshold.

15 Miss Feshold, are you here? Perhaps not.

16 F-e-s-h-o-l-d and it looks like Jayne, from Food and

17 Water Watch. No?

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

18

Randy Upton.

19 RANDY UPTON: Randy Upton, U-p-t-o-n, 2805

20 Merit Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada 89102. I'm president

21 of the Las Vegas Fly Fishing club.

In 1989 we filed protests against the

23 utilization of water from Spring Valley, Cave Valley

24 and associated areas. I have refiled those protests

25 | back in May of this year. Our intent at that time

was we understand the fragility of the water there, of course. Taking it out will poorly affect the wildlife and economics of the area.

1.3

2.2

BLM's interests is really not in the economics. They don't care what happens to them. Their charge is to protect our lands. And as a citizen of these United States, please protect my lands. All science points to the fact that as the water is diminished, wildlife and everything else in the area will be not beneficially affected.

So other things that have not necessarily been considered are the fact that the Great Basin is indeed a basin. It's a closed system. You pull the water out, it's not going back. So unless there's a plan by which to reestablish that water sometime, then this doesn't seem like a good idea. All the science that I have seen points to the fact that this will diminish the affects.

The other impacts of course has to be considered by BLM's right-of-way access is the 306 miles of road, the five pumping stations, all the power line access that's going to be required to be put in there, pipelines up to 84 inches. This is going to destroy the desert. I've been a sportsman in that area for 50-some years. I've seen the

69

```
1
     impacts of little things that occurred over time.
 2
     This is just beyond the pale.
 3
               So our position, as the Las Vegas Fly
 4
     Fishing Club and as a representative organization for
 5
     the Fly Fishing Federation of America, is we request
     that there is a No Action position taken by BLM.
 6
 7
     Actually we would prefer a denial with prejudice, but
 8
     our end goal is we found that when you take away
 9
     water, fish die. Try it at home.
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Lynn Davis.
10
11
               LYNN DAVIS: I'm Lynn Davis, L-y-n-n,
12
     D-a-v-i-s, 10300 West Charleston, 13-25, Las Vegas,
     89135.
1.3
14
               I'm Lynn Davis. I'm the senior program
15
     manager with the Nevada Field Office of the National
16
     Parks Conservation Association. NPCA's mission is to
17
     protect and enhance America's national parks for
18
     present and future generations. Founded in 1919,
19
     currently with more than 325,000 members,
20
     headquarters in our nation's capitol and 23 regional
21
     field offices, NPCA plays a crucial role in
2.2
     protecting America's treasured parks.
23
               NPCA is here today representing the
24
     interests and protection of Great Basin National Park
     on the eastern border of Nevada. Southern Nevada
25
```

Water Authority's pipeline proposal would pump precious groundwater in Spring Valley to the west of Great Basin National Park and Snake Valley to the east of the national park.

2.2

Groundwater modeling tests over the past couple of years conducted by the US Geological Survey, the National Park Service, and independent organizations raised all sorts of questions that SNWA's proposal will have on the national park.

Like all national parks, Great Basin

National Park is a special place. The park is not
only exceptionally scenic, it covers a broad range of
recreational opportunities. The park contains a wide
range of ecosystems that vary from desert to alpine,
one of a kind endemic species, including 4,000 to
5,000 year old Bristlecone pine.

Notably the park was first recognized for a notable cave system which relies on an underground water system. In this cave system recently unique one-of-a-kind species have been found and recently documented. NPCA registers grave concern that the national park's cave system will be harmed along with these very new endemic species. In addition the park's pristine air quality and dark night skies are among the best in the nation.

In 2004 and 2005, Great Basin was found to be among the darkest places in the lower 48 states giving park visitors a rare and very uncommon experience to experience starry night skies. The park's unspoiled air quality is due significantly to its remote distance from urban areas and from major pollution sources, as well as its location as in regards to prevailing winds. Lack of pollutant particles which scatter atmospheric light and increase sky glow provide park visitors with some of the best star gazing experiences.

2.2

SNWA's groundwater pumping plans, however, potentially threaten this resource. Pumping around the national park has a strong likelihood of affecting and possibly drying up stabilizing vegetation in valleys that surround the national park. In all likelihood this could create a dustbowl situation threatening the economic eco-tourism opportunities in the area and practically putting this national park at risk.

NPCA will be providing a more in-depth statement with documentation during this comment period. We request that No Action be taken as regards to SNWA's proposal to pump groundwater near Great Basin National Park on behalf of all Americans

72

```
1
     who value and cherish our national park system.
 2
     Thank you.
 3
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: I'm afraid I'm
 4
     quessing at this one but I believe it's Charles
 5
              Is that correct? Was I close, Mr. Musser?
     Musser.
 6
               CHARLES MUSSER:
                                That's close enough.
 7
               FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: You make me feel
 8
     better about my own handwriting. Thank you.
 9
               CHARLES MUSSER: My name is Charles Musser,
10
     M-u-s-s-e-r, 2304 Saddle Bill Court, North Las Vegas,
     89084.
11
12
               I've lived in this valley some 75 years, and
1.3
     when I was a kid we lived out on West Charleston.
                                                        We
14
     had a well that flowed. It didn't need a pump back
15
     in 1930s, forties. And when I was a little kid, you
16
     know, down on the corner of Valley View and
17
     Charleston there was a pipe coming out of the ground;
18
     the water came up six feet out of that pipe, no pump.
19
     And then the water district started putting their
20
     straws in the ground, that disappeared. And that's
21
     right where the water district office went on that
2.2
     corner. Then on below there's the McNeal Ranch with
23
     some ponds there and some springs. Those are all
24
            The old Bell Ranch, they're all gone.
25
               Our recreation in this valley has moved out
```

of the valley. There is no recreation in the valley for the outdoorsman now. I was up last weekend up in Spring Valley Park. And up there at the Eagle Valley Reservoir the campground was absolutely full of Clark County cars. Every foot around that lake was covered with a fisherman, except for Dundee there, you know. Fishermen from Clark County up there trying to get some recreation in.

2.2

And I went up to Upper Spring Valley, Fred
Baker ranch up there, known that family a long time,
and there's a little puddle up there on a place
called Silver Creek. And here's a Henderson resident
up there paddling his canoe around there. Dwayne
Potter, you know, he was up there paddling his canoe
around that little pond. Went all the way from here
up there to do that. That's what we do.

And if you take, the little spring creeks are going to disappear if you start putting straws in the ground up there. And so I would say to you that's a pristine area, it needs to stay pristine.

And if you take away the water up there, it just becomes a bunch of dirt. Wilderness and pristine areas without water is nothing more than a bunch of dirt.

And so I would urge you to take No Action

and save that for the citizens of Nevada. Take those ranches the water district has bought, turn them over to the state park system and develop them for local and all Nevadans to have a place to go for recreation. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Judy Treichel.

JUDY TREICHEL: My name is Judy Treichel,

T-r-e-i-c-h-e-l. I live at 4587 Ermine Court,

E-r-m-i-n-e, Las Vegas, 89147.

I'm the executive director of the Nevada

Nuclear Waste Task Force and we opposed Yucca

Mountain because we want to save what's good in

Nevada for Nevadans, for the Native Americans and for everything that it was here for, and I feel the same way about this water project. There is no extra water in Nevada. And I would ask that the No Action alternative be adopted and the right-of-way not be given for this project.

I agree that we need to recover from the recession, as was earlier stated. I support the idea that Nevada now has the opportunity to become a leader in renewable energy as well as Southern Nevada becoming a leading center of water conservation and innovation for sustainable living and responsible growth.

Guessing what the water conditions will be in the future is really a gamble. Over the past couple of years we've had some horrendous weather surprises. Recharges of any of the aquifers in the west cannot be guaranteed. Transferring water from one community to another is wrong. There's no extra water. Very likely the long-term outcome could be that all of Nevada becomes dry.

2.2

Please do not grant this right-of-way and do adopt the No Action alternative. The problem must be solved by this community without the sacrifice of another. Thank you.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Ann Brauer.

ANN BRAUER: My name is Ann Brauer, no E on Ann, B-r-a-u-e-r. I live in Indian Springs, 89018.

I am active with the Toiyabe chapter of the Sierra Club and the Great Basin Water Network, but I'm here to represent myself and my family. We have lived in Nevada for 46 years.

First of all, I would request that the comment period is not adequate and needs to be extended to at least 180 days. It's a 5,000 page document with the input from 32 agencies and 23 tribal groups involving hundreds of people and taking six years to prepare. We can't read that fast and

analyze that fast.

1.3

2.2

Secondly, I would suggest that the scope of the DEIS is not adequate, and there is reason for a supplemental DEIS that covers the entire project, all the well fields, lateral lines, power lines, the entire project plus the new idea of distributed pumping, which was not on the docket when this was started.

The DEIS fails to address in any real terms the cost of this project. How much will it cost to build the entire project, not just the ditch and the pipeline. And where will the money come from to pay for it? Money costs money. Who will pay for the project that is several times the budget of the State of Nevada? Should we trust that Southern Nevada Water Authority will be able to do this when they have gone and spent inflated millions of dollars to buy ranches to try to force their way into Spring Valley?

What are the costs of the monitoring,
management and mitigation oversight and enforcement?

How can we be sure the monitoring and mitigation will
be adequate? Who will see the data? Will it be
publicly available in a timely manner? There's more
than one way to analyze the data and it needs to be

out there.

2.2

The need for the project is not sufficiently addressed in this DEIS. This has gone from a stupid idea, to drought protection and now to a possible future need. There are alternatives that are far more viable, far less detrimental. Why aren't these examined in the DEIS?

Changes in climate change are not addressed, the consequences of climate change on this. This water in the White Pine, Lincoln and the valleys up there is not a reliable source of water for Southern Nevada. It will not be long-term. It will not be permanent. When it's gone, it's gone. There is no excess water in these valleys.

There are too many irreversible and irretrievable consequences associated with this project. I believe that the DEIS is deficient, incomplete and premature. The cart has been put before the horse. SNWA has no water rights, and as far as we can see does not have the financial resources to build this.

Based on the many topics inadequately addressed in the DEIS, which have been pointed out by many speakers today, there should be a supplemental draft EIS before the final decision is reached;

however, if BLM is determined to rush to a decision based on the current document, then it is obvious that the only possibility is the No Action alternative. That is the only course possible if BLM is to fulfill its stated mission to sustain the health, diversity and productivity of public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and especially future generations. Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Linda Overbey.

LINDA OVERBEY: I'm Linda Overbey,
O-v-e-r-b-e-y, Overbey, 2256 Grand Clover Lane, Las
Vegas, 89156.

I really had decided I would write a comment and put it in later but some things I heard tonight made me want to stand up, and I have told myself that I have to make a vow to be active. And so despite my verbal dyslexia, I'm going to say these things.

I had written out things about the dust that you're own report says is going to be created. And I appreciate the fact that you created this study and I could read it, but one of my points was that I thought it was sort of a funny extreme. I was going to say that who knows if 50 years down the line will people be suing you for knowingly putting dust into the atmosphere that caused asthma and lung cancer.

1 Come to find out they did that in Owens Valley.

2 They've already sued the water district in Los

3 Angeles for creating all those things, so that was

4 taken.

1.3

2.2

All my other good ideas you guys already got. You said those things for me. My real issues are I'm union and I appreciate what the AFL-CIO says and I understand their point of view, but I don't think that we can fix the economic crisis by acting in haste to build this pipeline. I think that now is the time for Las Vegas to be a vanguard city in water sustainability. I think that jobs can be created that way in retrofitting buildings and creating water basins and many other ways. Like I said, I'm not a scientist but I see these things.

I think that we're responding to the potential of water crisis in an antiquated way. I think it's kind of like when a city is sprawling and sprawling and has smog and traffic gridlock they say let's build more roads when they should be building up their public transport. You know, it's antiquated.

By the time that this pipeline is done, we'll already be expecting it and we'll have allocated all that water usage. We'll be using it.

We need to learn to live within our water means. And I think that we're creative as a species and we can do that; whereas, the animals and plants that are up there can't make those adjustments. You know, let's not create an ugly desert up there. It's gorgeous up there. It's the antidote to this place. Let's leave it as it is.

2.2

And, you know, the fellow that said that water rights are for everyone, I don't know the legal standing of that. I know that I feel like it's morally wrong for us to say that, you know. What happens to the farmers and ranchers and the fishermen and the plants and the mustangs and all those creatures that are up there is nothing compared to our growth. To me we're big enough. I know that I can't stop the growth here, and I'm not antigrowth, I just think that we need to be sensible about these things.

And, you know, I don't think that destroying the area up there is worth the few little jobs that it will create, the few temporary jobs it will create. Thanks. I really appreciate your time.

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Ed Uehling.

ED UEHLING: Yes, my name is Ed Uehling, Ed, E-d, Uehling, U-e-h-l-i-n-g. I live at 3418 Oneida

Way in Las Vegas.

2.2

This project is premised on two premises that are both lies. The number one premise is that there is a drought. The number two premises is there's no other solution to this. So I want to look at those two issues because everything depends on those two lies that the water authority is telling us.

The Colorado River flows within 20 miles of Las Vegas, about 20 miles from Las Vegas, and it flows. The flow in the river ranges between about 6.5 million acre feet a year to about 8.5 million acre feet a year, an average flow of around 7 million acre feet. That is not a drought. The drought is in brain cells of people who are using, allowing millions, about four million, over four million acre feet of water to be pulled out of the Colorado River and poured onto farms in the middle of the desert to raise alfalfa or cotton or some crops like this that are totally uneconomical.

They're uneconomical because these people are able to steal the water or take the water out of the river and just pour it on the land. They don't use any conservation, modern conservation irrigation procedures; they use twelfth century irrigation

technology. And there is plenty of water in the
Colorado River, up to seven million acre feet.

Nevada was allocated 300,000 acre feet, about five

percent of the flow of the river.

2.2

So that gets to my second subject, the second premise on which this is based, that there is no other solution. That's just total nonsense. All they have to do is just change some of the regulations of how the Colorado River water is dealt with. There are many ways of dealing with it. And all this is is one more subterfuge of the federal government. The federal government created this problem in the first place and now the federal government, through BLM, is going to create a second huge problem by denuding the landscape in Northern Nevada.

But there's a solution. It's very easy for the federal government to adopt. There are many solutions, in fact. One is the Southern Nevada Water Authority could be permitted to buy farms in the Imperial Valley or in the Arizona valleys. They're using these incredible sums of water and substitute water here. But the federal rules don't permit that. We can't do that. They can change other rules but they can't change rules like that.

They can do desalting in Mexico and They can, as stated here, they can substitute water. substitute water from the north. One thing that's been very effective in Las Vegas where Pat Mulroy has raised the cost of water from what, about a dollar a thousand gallons to now as much as \$4 per thousand gallons is the federal government can simply charge for the water that's taken out of the river. will immediately fill up Lake Mead. It will immediately produce all the water that Las Vegas could ever need because the farmers who are growing alfalfa with their five feet of water that they get, that they pour on this land, or in some cases some of the farms down there put 20 feet of water, that's the height of this ceiling, on their crops. So if these exchanges were allowed to be made, this problem is very easily solved.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

What hasn't been discussed, some of the things that haven't been discussed are how much is it going to cost for the construction of this? The water authority is already \$5 billion in debt. They can't meet their own budget. They're spending their reserves just to be able to operate this year, and they only have to transport water 20 miles. How much is it going to cost to transport water 300 miles for

this agency? This is a coverup for the total incompetence of the Las Vegas Valley Water District and Southern Nevada Water Authority, and it's too bad that BLM is supporting that. Thank you.

2.2

FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: Dr. Jacob Paz.

DR. JACOB PAZ: Good evening. Dr. Jacob

Paz. I have two comments to make. When I read the
environmental impact statement, I found it fermented.

It does not very well discuss the cumulative affect
and the cumulative impact of the component which are
agriculture, groundwater. It's like a chain reaction
and this must be updated.

Second, I propose that this alternative of the pipeline should withdraw and have an alternative pipeline for this reservation of water taken from the Atlantic Ocean. Using solar energy, you can work with Arizona and you will have both electricity and water and it's much more cost effective and I'm sure Senator Reid would sponsor it. Thank you.

DR. MICHAEL DWYER: That was our last person who signed up to speak. We have a little bit of time left. Does anyone else want to come up and make a statement? If not, thank you again so much for being here.

DEAN BAKER: One of the things that was

talked about is the ownership of the water, and I mentioned that the Donner family came in 1862. That water in Burbank Meadows was divided before there were any state laws but largely before there were any states, either Utah or Nevada, and they didn't know which one it was going to be. And those rights are rights that were established before their state laws. And the state laws say they're vested rights so they predate the taking of water by the State of Nevada. So that is a different thing.

1.3

2.2

The water costs in Las Vegas, the Las Vegas people should look carefully at the actual cost of water when they have taken ten percent of the land sales money, you get part of the sales tax money on the connection fees rather than the real costs of the water to the people, and they should look at the costs of this.

And I so strongly believe that this pipeline and trying to get the water would be a disaster worse for Las Vegas than it will be for us in the way that it will hurt many thousands of people because I do not believe, my experience says that they can't keep that pipeline full and the people will be dependent on it so they'll try to keep whatever they can get or take it further to get it.

1 And the Owens Valley, I have slips here 2 again, but when they started the pumping of water in 3 1970, their immediate drawdowns in the valley were 4 such that created the environmental problems. And 5 when you look at their drawdown springs and what it 6 did, in was an immediate impact that shows again a 7 place, and Owens Valley is against the Sierra Pacific 8 which gets many times, many, many times the water 9 that falls in the driest part of Nevada. So to think 10 that this pipeline will work for them, I think it 11 will hurt Southern Nevada. Anyway, thank you. 12 DR. MICHAEL DWYER: Anybody else? I'll go 1.3 ahead and close the hearing. Thanks again. 14 FACILITATOR JOHN GODEC: If I can just 15 mention, if someone would like to make a comment 16 privately with our court reporter, we will be here 17 for a few minutes. And if someone would like a hard 18 copy of the full executive summary, we have some 19 copies at the table. Please feel free to ask one of 20 our folks for one. Thanks very much. 21 (Thereupon the proceedings 2.2 were concluded at 7:19 p.m.) 23 24

25

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF NEVADA)
3	SS:
4	COUNTY OF NYE)
5	I, Deborah Ann Hines, certified court
6	reporter, do hereby certify that I took down in
7	shorthand (Stenotype) all of the proceedings had in
8	the before-entitled matter at the time and place
9	indicated; and that thereafter said shorthand notes
10	were transcribed into typewriting at and under my
11	direction and supervision and the foregoing
12	transcript constitutes a full, true and accurate
13	record of the proceedings had.
14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto affixed
15	my hand this 14th day of September, 2011.
16	
17	
18	
19	Deborah Ann Hines, CCR #473, RPR
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	